

Concordia University  
Council of the John Molson School of Business  
Minutes of meeting held  
Friday, April 4, 2003

**Present:** J. Tomberlin (Chair)  
A. Ahmad (Fina.), J. Ahmad (Econ.), K. Argheyd (Mana.), C. Bayne (DS&MIS),  
H. Bhabra (Fina.), S. Bognar (Mana.), B. K. Buyukkurt (Mktg.), C. Draimin  
(Acco.), G. Fisher (Econ.), S. Fontaine (Staff), S. K. Goyal (DS&MIS), A.  
Guindon (Lib.), A. B. Ibrahim (Assoc. Dean), G. Kanaan (Assoc. Dean), R.  
Knitter (Mana.), E. Maddoo (CASA), M. Magnan, D. Morin (Assoc. Dean), R. J.  
Oppenheimer (Mana.), S. Ray (Mktg.), P. Regimbald (Reg.), S. Robinson  
(Acco.), C. A. Ross (Mktg.), E. Sacca (SGS), M. Sharma (DS&MIS), C. Y. Suen  
(Comp.Sci.)

**Regrets:** P. Bolla, M. Gowing, M. R. Kapoor, W. A. Merhi, F. Nebebe, D. Peltier-Rivest,  
M. Perugini, P. Tragoulas

**I Call to Order**  
The meeting was called to order at 9:35.

**II Closed Meeting**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

III Open Meeting

IV Approval of Agenda - JMSB-2003-03A

*It was moved by S. Bognar and seconded by M. Magnan that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion was carried unanimously.*

V Approval of the Minutes - JMSB-2003-02M

*It was moved by M. Sharma and seconded by C. Bayne that the minutes of the meeting held March 7, JMSB-2003-02M, be approved with the following amendment: p. 3 – third paragraph last line – delete: (& Appeals) The motion was carried unanimously.*

VI Chair's Report and Question Period (*maximum 15 minutes*)

J. Tomberlin welcomed new Council member, S. Fontaine, and Dean Sacca, School of Graduate Studies. He congratulated CASA for their efforts in getting the votes needed for the success of the Evolutionary Party in the CSU elections. With regard to the new building, he advised that the building committee would meet next week to develop a process for analyzing the input received from the departments and programs by the end of the month. The groundbreaking ceremony is expected to take place next winter with the official opening taking place in January 2006.

A discussion concerning the draft for the new building ensued.

The Chair assured Council members that their input on all aspects of the draft would be welcomed by the committee and advised that to-date, he had not signed off on any portion of the plan. In response to a concern about the MBA space allocation, he advised that substantial revisions would be made prior to signing off on the plans. In reply to a concern about the Management department being located on two floors, he advised that the intent was to promote interaction among the departments. One member of Council stated that there was a need for one or two case rooms with a capacity for thirty students.

With regard to concerns about security, the Chair affirmed that it was an important issue to be addressed.

**VII Council Elections**

There were no elections.

**VIII Business Arising from Previous Meeting**

- i) **Update on Criteria for Prize Winners - JMSB-2003-02A-04**  
In response to a question raised at the March 7<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, G. Kanaan reported that the Frosst, Administration, and Ross medals were based on the cumulative GPA and the departmental medals are based on the GPA of the major discipline.
- ii) **Status of the Standing Committee on Academic Re-Evaluation**  
G. Kanaan reported that the committee had been discontinued.

**IX Report: Graduate Programs, Research and Program Evaluation**

D. Morin advised that curriculum revisions, appraisal information and external grants results would be presented at the next meeting of Council. With regard to concerns raised at the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting about the number of incomplete application files in the winter 2003 Ph.D. and M.Sc. statistics, she reported that the correct number was four incomplete files. The number was far less than indicated because many of the files included in the incomplete category were in fact refusals, files missing GMAT scores, transcripts and reference letters.

**X CGSA Report**

There was no report.

**XI Report: External Affairs and Executive Programs**

M. Magnan reported the success of the The Best of the Best Extravaganza held April 7 that raised approximately \$100,000 for Ph.D Fellowships for the JMSB.

**XII Report: Administrative Affairs and Human Resources**

B. Ibrahim extended congratulations to the MBA students on their success in the Ivey competition.

**XIII Report: Undergraduate Programs, Academic and Student Affairs**

There was nothing to report.

**XIV Reports from School Representatives on University Committees**

- i) **University Senate** There was no report.
- ii) **Arts and Science Faculty Council**  
R. Knitter reported that the Council discussed the Faculty's 8% enrolment growth, the opening of the new science building in September, and curriculum changes.

She noted that there were positive comments regarding the establishment of the JMSB General Education committee.

There were no reports from the representatives of the following committees:

- iii) Senate Academic Planning and Priorities
- iv) Senate Academic Programs Committee
- v) Senate Research Committee
- vi) University Library Committee
- vii) Undergraduate Scholarships and Awards Sub-committee
- viii) Board of Governors
- ix) Council of the School of Graduate Studies

**XV CASA Report**

E. Maddoo highlighted the report distributed to Council and congratulated P. Tragoulis and S. Miller who were both awarded the Outstanding Student Award for their contributions to Concordia University.

**XVI New Business**

- i) Motion Regarding Peer Evaluations – JMSB-2003-03A-02

The following motion was presented at the March 4 Senate Steering Committee meeting by R. Lee, CSU. The Steering Committee members referred the issue to Council for consideration.

WHEREAS group work is an essential part of many courses;

WHEREAS peer evaluations is used in various departments and used to grade students;

WHEREAS at present there is no mechanism to allow for students to have peer evaluations re-evaluated;

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** all departments that use group work and peer evaluations be mandated to set up a streamlined mechanism to allow for re-evaluations in cases of group work and peer evaluation.

It was noted that the proposed motion has a direct impact on the JMSB where teamwork is essential to preparing students for the business environment. An Ad-Hoc committee of the Marketing Department considered this issue and have concurred with the regulations of the undergraduate calendar that disallow re-evaluation of peer evaluations fearing that re-evaluation would open the door to harassment and intimidation. The committee recommended that groups be carefully monitored and introduced to conflict management techniques.

*It was moved by D. Morin and seconded by A. Ahmad that Council grant speaking privileges to S. Brutus, a researcher in the area of non-traditional appraisal.*  
*The motion was carried unanimously.*

S. Brutus stated that the essentials of peer evaluation are the assurance of the anonymity of the evaluator and due process that allows access to the evaluation. This can be achieved by omitting the evaluator's name or by giving the comments to a third party to type. The process can be questioned. The evaluation is final.

During the discussion the following comments were noted:

- Peer evaluation enriches the assessment process
- Peer evaluation can be seen as an incentive or penalty depending on the individual student's response
- The outcome of peer evaluation is based on learning appropriate behavior
- Devise a strategy to ensure the motion is defused at Senate
- Be sure that students can access the evaluation without identifying the evaluator(s)
- Students have the right to have re-evaluations
- There are no standards set for peer evaluation
- Abuse of peer evaluation can be circumvented by a weighted assessment
- Students must be informed of the grading weights in the syllabus
- The objective of group work and peer evaluation is to enhance interpersonal skills
- Professors must manage conflict to ensure the process works well
- The evaluation process must be standardized throughout the departments
- A peer evaluation reflects the reality of evaluator(s)

It was generally agreed that the Council would develop a motion in response to Mr. Lee's motion. The motion would recognize the students' right of appeal while adhering to the principles of peer evaluation that protect the anonymity of the evaluator and allow the student access to the evaluation.

*It was moved by A. Ahmad and seconded by H. Bhabra that Council refrain from support of the motion proposed by Mr. R. Lee.*

*The motion was carried (11 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions)*

- ii) Revised procedure for the approval of graduation lists –  
JMSB-2003-03A-03

*It was moved by M. Magnan and seconded by M. Sharma that Council approve the proposed procedure for the approval of graduation lists as described in document JMSB-2003-03A-03.*

M. Magnan explained that the purpose of the revision was to save approximately forty-five minutes of time at Council by having one motion to approve the lists and one motion to allow the Registrar's office to add candidates to the list based on receipt of required documents.

One member of Council expressed his concern that Council members would not review the documents prior to the meeting as in the case of the review of documents for Honorary Doctorates and Awards of Distinction.

The Chair pointed out that the process was identical to the procedure used by Senate for the past few years.

*The mover and the seconder agreed to amend the procedure to provide that the problem lists would be distributed to Council for review.*

*The motion was carried unanimously.*

**XVII Other Business**

**XVIII Adjournment**

*It was moved by H. Bhabra and seconded by S. Bognar that the meeting be adjourned.*

*The motion was carried unanimously.*

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10.

**XIX Next meeting**

The next regular meeting of Council will take place on Friday, May 16, 2003 in room GM302.